UNITY

FREEDOM, FELLOWSHIP AND CHARACTER IN RELIGION

(Jenkin Lloyd Jones, Editor, 1880-1918)

John Haynes Holmes, *Editor in Chief*

Associate Editors

Francis Neilson Louis L. Mann Curtis W. Reese

Arbitration

By SYDNEY STRONG

The Outlawry of War

By WALTER WALSH

Letters from Bartolomeo Vanzetti

By ELIZABETH GLENDOWER EVANS

England's Bunker Hill

By MARY D. BRADFORD

The Story of My Experiments with Truth

Part III. Chapter X. By M. K. GANDHI

(To increase the number of UNITY'S Readers—see page 243)

VOLUME XCIX NUMBER 15

Chicago, June 13, 1927

PUBLISHED WEEKLY

UNITY

Subscription, $3.00 per Annum

(Established 1878)

A JOURNAL *of the* RELIGION *of* DEMOCRACY

JOHN HAYNES HOLMES, EDITOR IN CHIEF

ASSOCIATE EDITORS

FRANCIS NEILSON LOUIS L. MANN CURTIS W. REESE

UNITY Fellowship

FRANK C. DOAN
CHARLES F. DOLE
ZONA GALE
JESSE H. HOLMES
JOHN HAYNES HOLMES
H. R. MUSSEY
FRANCIS NEILSON
EDMUND H. REEMAN
ALSON H. ROBINSON
CLARENCE R. SKINNER
SYDNEY STRONG
ARTHUR L. WEATHERLY

Managing Editor
EDITH LLOYD JONES

Vol. 1 March 1, 1878 No. 1

THE

Pamphlet Mission

FOR

FREEDOM, FELLOWSHIP & CHARACTER

IN

RELIGION.

Publishing Committee:

ROBERT COLLYER, Chicago. WM. C. GANNETT, St. Paul.
JENKIN LL. JONES, Janesville. C. W. WENDTE, Cincinnati.
J. C. LEARNED, St. Louis.

PUBLISHED SEMI-MONTHLY AT 65 WASHINGTON ST., CHICAGO.
Per Year, $1.50. Single Number, 10 Cents.

FRANCIS L. ROBERTS, 65 Washington St., Chicago, - Business Agent.
J. T. SUNDERLAND, 65 Washington St., Chicago, } Editors of
GEO. W. COOKE, Grand Haven, Mich., - } "Notes and News."

Editorial Contributors

W. Waldemar W. Argow
Charles E. Beals
Harry Foster Burns
Percy M. Dawson
James Waldo Fawcett
David Starr Jordan
Joseph Ernest McAfee
Anna Garlin Spencer
Frederick Starr
Jabez T. Sunderland
James H. West

Foreign Representatives

AUSTRALIA—Charles Strong
AUSTRIA—Stefan Zweig
BULGARIA—F. M. Matthéeff
CANADA—Sidney Snow
CHINA—Gilbert Reid
ENGLAND—Fred Hankinson
Walter Walsh
FRANCE—G. Demartial
Romain Rolland
GERMANY—Theodor Hahn
INDIA—Rabindranath Tagore
ITALY—Guglielmo Lusidi
JAPAN—Nobuichiro Imaoha
RUSSIA—Afina Huebach

UNITY PUBLISHING Co., Abraham Lincoln Centre, 700 Oakwood Blvd., Chicago, Ill.

"Entered as Second-Class Matter, January 12, 1899, at the Postoffice at Chicago, Illinois, under Act of March 3, 1879"

REMEMBER

This Summer

UNITY will publish letters from

CHINA

by

ANNA LOUISE STRONG

To begin about the middle of June

Subscribe Now!

For $1.00 UNITY will be sent to a new subscriber for six months. Send a name and a dollar. Or more names and more dollars. Or the dollars alone and UNITY Office can supply the names.

Names .....

.....

.....

Unity Publishing Company, 700 Oakwood Boulevard, Chicago.

Contents

EDITORIAL— Page

Notes 231
Arbitration.—REV. SYDNEY STRONG..... 234
Jottings.—J. H. H..... 235

ARTICLES—

A Propos Sacco and Vanzetti.—*The Apology of Socrates* 231
The Outlawry of War—WALTER WALSH..... 236
Letters from Bartolomeo Vanzetti—ELIZABETH GLENDOWER EVANS..... 239
England's Bunker Hill—MARY D. BRADFORD.. 240
The Story of My Experiments with Truth—Part III, Chapter X—The Boer War—M. K. GANDHI 241

POETRY—

The Unity of the Mind—ELMO A. ROBINSON. 235

THE STUDY TABLE—

"The American Race Problem"—ARTHUR L. WEATHERLY 242

THE FIELD—

International Fellowship of Reconciliation..... 243

UNITY

"HE HATH MADE OF ONE ALL NATIONS OF MEN"

VOLUME XCIX MONDAY, JUNE 13, 1927 NUMBER 15

À PROPOS SACCO AND VANZETTI

However, men of Athens, I do not think much defence is needed to show that I am innocent of the charge Meletus has made; I think I have now said enough. But what I told you before, namely, that there is deep and widespread enmity against me, that, you must remember, is perfectly true. And this is what will overthrow me, if I am overthrown—not Meletus nor yet Anytus, but the prejudices and envy of the majority, forces that have overthrown many a good man ere now, and will, I imagine, overthrow many more. There is little fear that it will end with me.

The Apology of Socrates.

Not since the announcement of Mahatma Gandhi's autobiography, has UNITY been privileged to make so important an announcement as that of the forthcoming publication in these columns of a series of letters by Miss Anna Louise Strong from China. Miss Strong, the daughter of our own beloved Sydney Strong, went to Russia in 1919, and since that time has spent most of her time in Russia and the Orient. She has traveled again and again through these regions, has met all important public leaders, and is intimately familiar from the inside with what is going on. She has recently gone to China, to gather material for lectures and writings on this country comparable to what she has already done on Russia. During her stay, she has promised to write us a series of intimate, chatty letters, telling what she is seeing and doing, and interpreting events in the light of her extensive knowledge and liberal spirit. China is now the center of the world's attention. The importance of these letters need not be dilated upon. They should begin this month. For the months during which they will appear, UNITY is happy to offer a special trial subscription at one dollar.

In accordance with the practice of earlier years, UNITY will go on a bi-weekly basis during the summer. Our next issue, that is, will appear on June 27th, and succeeding issues will appear at fortnightly intervals until September 19th, when weekly publication will be resumed. All regular departments of the paper will be continued with the exception of "Jottings," which will be suspended during this period. Two chapters of Gandhi's autobiography (instead of one) will be printed in each bi-weekly issue, that there may be no delay in the appearance of this great work. Miss Strong's letters from China (see above) will be the special summer feature. We have found in the past that subscribers as well as editors have welcomed this bi-weekly basis of publication during the vacation months. It is a rest and relief all around! The usual system of extending the subscription period for those requesting such extension, will be followed.

Why is Charles Lindbergh so popular a hero? The first answer, of course, pertains to the greatness of his achievement. When a certain commentator declares that the flight from New York to Paris was the most glorious single exploit ever accomplished by one man alone, he is close to truth. Columbus's voyage to America, Magellan's circumnavigation of the globe, La Salle's journey down the Mississippi, Peary's discovery of the North Pole, Captain Scott's return from the South Pole, were all greater as they were more significant feats. But no man ever launched forth alone upon such a venture as that which Lindbergh attempted, and carried through with an equal mixture of courage and skill. In this respect, the gallant American stands alone. Next, in explanation of Lindbergh's popularity, come certain moral qualities as rare as they are beautiful. Thus, there is his incomparable *modesty*. The young man feels unfeigned delight in his achievement, even pride; but from the beginning he has betrayed not a trace of boastfulness or arrogance. On the contrary, he has been as simple as a child. His letters of introduction, his constant identification of himself with his machine, his refusal to be spoiled by adulation or bought with money, all attest a native modesty of soul. Then, there is his *generosity*. The builder of his motor must share the acclaims! Nungesser, who failed, had a much more difficult trip flying from east to west! France has the bravest flyers in the world! These were the utterances of a gentleman who claimed everything for others, nothing for himself. Lastly, there is what F. P. A. has well called his *"bunklessness."* From first to last, he has been free from "bunk" of every description. No silly talk about his mother—no sentimental twaddle

about the U. S. A.—no bromides of any kind. Not a pose, not a gesture, for effect! The boy is just himself, genuine to the core. And a people, fed up with "bunk" from politicians, Ku Klux Klans, American Legions, "movie" stars, prize-fighters, and channel-swimmers, clasp him rapturously to their hearts. Never was there such a hero as Charles Lindbergh. He deserves everything he's got!

Robert Underwood Johnson has done a service second only to that of President Butler in calling the attention of the State Department to the Briand offer of a treaty outlawing war between the United States and France, and asking the Department to use the present happy occasion of the Lindbergh exploit as the opportunity for accepting the offer. Never in any age or place was it so true that "now is the appointed time!" Whatever the uses of Lindbergh's matchless achievement in the field of aeronautics, its uses in the field of international relations, as between the two great western republics at least, is beyond all calculation. In a trice, as though by some magical rite, all ill-feeling between France and America has been wiped away. The irritation of the French people against this country, if it ever really existed at all, is shown to be a superficial and passing thing. The aloofness of the United States from Europe, if it ever had any genuine substance, is discovered to be an incident or accident of politics. Whatever has happened that should not have happened, whatever wrongs real or fancied have vexed us, we are brothers "under the skin." Lindbergh's flight, like "one touch of nature," has made the whole world kin. And closest in kinship are these two nations whose greatest cities mark the termini of the most wonderful single voyage in human history. Now let Secretary Kellogg reach forth his hand to clasp the already extended hand of Secretary Briand! Let Washington call to Paris that war between these two thus gloriously united peoples is forevermore unthinkable! Let a treaty now be written in the English and the French tongues pledging the two republics to *outlaw war* as between themselves for all time to come, and calling upon other nations to do the same with them and with one another. After what Charles Lindbergh has done, all things are possible. Even war can be conquered! Mr. Johnson is right. The hour has been struck as though by the hand of God, and the Coolidge administration must not fail to heed.

The story of England's break with Soviet Russia brings final testimony of the lamentable weakness of the Prime Minister. Mr. Baldwin has long held the personal liking and esteem of men of all parties in the British isles. He is amiable, modest, generous, and of good intent. For a time, also, he was respected as a man of genuine strength. But of late indications have been multiplying that his armament is of the "Quaker gun" variety. Early in his present administration it became evident that there was a disastrous rift in his cabinet. On the one hand were the "moderates"—men like Baldwin himself who were conservative, but at the same time sensible, patient and far-seeing. On the other hand were the "die-hards"—men like Birkenhead and Joynson-Hicks who saw in the enormous Tory majority in the present Parliament a weapon to destroy ruthlessly and effectively all enemies at home and abroad. This rift was seen to be dangerous—but Baldwin was trusted to hold the party together, and swing the balance of power to the side of the "moderates." The first big test came with the coal strike, when the Premier failed utterly to hold the "die-hards" in check. The second test came with the great general strike. Here Baldwin seemed to curb all men to his will, and master the situation; in the few days following the strike, he was at the zenith of his fame and influence. Then came one of the most ignominious collapses in English political history. Within a month Baldwin was in full retreat before the madmen of his own party; his solemn promises were broken, his policies of moderation flouted, his control of his own cabinet defied and denied. Now, with startling suddenness, come the incredible anti-trade union bill, the sensational raid on Soviet headquarters in London, and the severing of diplomatic relations with Russia! All this is contrary to Baldwin's will and spirit. It is perfectly evident that he is feebly consenting to what as titular leader he can no longer help. The Prime Minister is revealed as a weakling of the first order. The "die-hards," now completely triumphant, must soon get rid of him in scorn and disgust. P. W. Wilson's recent forecast of Winston Churchill as the next premier, was timely.

Of the break with Russia itself, no words can exaggerate the menacing importance. It was absolutely without excuse or justification; the raid on Arcos Ltd. failed utterly to reveal the much-desired evidence. Of course, Russia was disclosed as actively engaged in serving her own particular and peculiar international interests. But this was no more and no worse than all nations in this imperialistic age are doing all the time. Was any government, asked Lloyd-George, in his notable opposition speech, "guiltless of military espionage on other powers?" Mr. Arthur Ponsonby was even more direct. "Forgery, theft, lying, bribery, and corruption," he declared, "exist in every foreign office and chancellery throughout the world." The very absence of reason, however, together with the disastrous effects impending upon British trade, only emphasize the almost fanatical determination of the English "die-hards" to do what Lloyd George solemnly character-

ized as "one of the gravest things ever done by this country (England)." What is "on" is the old campaign to destroy Russia. Already we are told that France will follow the lead of Great Britain in breaking with the Soviets, and that other countries will one by one do the same. The case of the anti-Soviets here in America is of coursce immeasurably strengthened. Germany has no desire to sever relations with Moscow, but, thanks to her membership in the League of Nations, her hand may be forced at any time. In Russia herself, the moderates of the Stalin type are thrown on the defensive, while the extremists of the Zinovieft type are quickened beyond anything they have known since the days of the Kolchak and Denikin invasions. All of which means that the lines for the next war are being rapidly formed! What we face at this hour is the most menacing situation since the Great War. International imperialism has recovered sufficiently from the 1914 experience to marshal her forces against her one remaining enemy. The editor of the New York *World* knew what he was doing when he headed a picture of Sir William Joynson-Hicks with the caption, "He may prove the fuse that starts another war."

An amusing feature of England's break with Russia, if, anything can be amusing in this vast international tragedy, is the rollicking enthusiasm of our old and decrepid friend, the American Federation of Labor. Mr. Matthew Woll, a Vice-President of this hoary organization, waxes fairly lyrical in his approval of what the English Tories have done. He declares that Joynson-Hicks and the rest of the English cabinet have discovered only what the Federation of Labor knew years ago—that England has now done only what the Federation has insisted that the United States should do from the beginning—that what has happened is only what the Federation wanted to happen and now vociferously rejoices over. All of which simply proves not that Russia is bad or that England is good, but that the American Federation of Labor holds exactly the same views and occupies exactly the same attitude on contemporary questions of industry and international politics as the "die-hards" of the Tory Party in Great Britian! Mr. Green lines up not with Ramsay MacDonald but with Mr. Baldwin. Mr. Woll stands shoulder to shoulder not with Mr. Clynes and Mr. Snowden but with Lord Birkenhead and Winston Churchill. The whole Federation gang, in other words, gives its support to, and casts in its lot with, not the British Labor Party, not even the Liberal Party, not even the moderate wing of the Tory Party, but the most extreme, cruel, and hard-fisted crowd of reactionaries in the British dominions today. If anything could more fully prove the truth of our contention, voiced again and again in this paper, that the American Federation of Labor is a dead-rot, gone-to-seed, hard-boiled, stand-pat organization, we would like to know what it is. The Federation once did great and noble work, but this period of its history ended long ago. Today, it resolutely opposes every forward-looking movement, and as resolutely sustains every reversionary policy and idea. It is the one biggest obstacle in America to any real progress in the world of labor. Of course, if labor likes this sort of thing, this is just the sort of thing that labor likes! But meanwhile American labor has no right to complain if those who seek industrial emancipation have little interest in or sympathy for anything that it is doing today.

If there is any one thing more than any other which makes us supremely tired, it is the ever-recurring prophecy that a great spiritual revival is just around the corner. We entered the ministry some twenty-three years ago, and every year during this period—nay, every six months, or oftener—some befuddled optimist has reared up to proclaim that religion is about to sweep the world. An English bishop is the latest to scan the horizon, and discover the portends of a vast revival. Such silly prophets are to be classified with the prognosticators of doom who periodically arise to announce the end of the world. Both groups are utterly removed from reality, live in a world of their own imaginative creation, feed by day as well by night on moonshine. As a matter of fact, during all this last quarter of a century in which we have been particularly concerned with religion, there has not been the slightest indication of the cataclysmic phenomenon which these ecclesiastical prophets have in mind when they speak of a "spiritual revival." What they invariably forecast is a return of the multitudes to the churches, a sudden and great awakening of public interest in the Bible, the creeds, the Lord Christ, a swift restoration of fidelity to the accepted rites of pious Christian worship and observance. Nothing of this kind is in the wind. The whole momentum of our age is away from not towards the organized religious life which has survived into our time from out the past. Every year sees the people of city and country more completely secularized, their activities more independent of ecclesiastical control, their very thought written in language as alien to the vocabulary of organized religion as the popular dialects of the Middle Ages were alien to the Latin of the Church. All this we count as good. A new religion born of the common life of the people, a new church sprung from the community of every day, these are at last appearing. With them are rolling in tides of real spiritual life which portend a veritable flood of human efficiency and joy. But the bishops and the priests know nothing of this; or, if they know it, they fear it as the end of their religion. And so it is, beyond any revival of old superstition which their hocus-pocus can devise.

Arbitration

Arbitration is a method of settling disputes. Of course, it would be better if there were no disputes. The best regulated families and social orders are those in which differences do not get to the stage of dispute; in which tolerance and conciliation play the major part. There are many families and schools, e. g. so regulated by common sense and conciliation, in which for years differences do not reach the stage of dispute. From the best families and schools all appeal to the "rod" —to force—has been eliminated.

Unhappily, differences between nations proceed to the stage of dispute. The spirit of common sense and conciliation that governs in well-regulated families and schools has not secured a hold on the nations in their relations with each other. Nations are suspicious and afraid of each other. In consequence, the nations have been led into believing that their safety lay in the possession of arms for the defense of their opinions, that culminated in differences and passed on to the stage of dispute. It has been thought that an opinion, not supported by force, would not be respected.

Supposing, then, a situation in which international differences have passed on to the stage of dispute! The ordinary means of conciliation have been tried, and have failed. The suggestion of war—or the use of force, as an arbiter—enters into the public mind. This is a situation in which common sense would indicate the parties in dispute should turn to arbitration, instead of to the more expensive and disappointing method of force. . . . Here, we should like to point out two things:

1. In all international disputes, conciliatory measures for settlement are the most satisfactory, and therefore should be first exhausted. Conciliation is better than arbitration. Let us give an illustration from our experience, in a visit to Mexico, last January, as a member of a group that had an interview with President Calles. One of the questions, we asked, was, "President Calles, would you be willing to arbitrate the differences between Mexico and the United States?" He replied,

> My government would be glad to arbitrate, if necessary. However, no government is anxious to go into arbitration, and for two reasons. The decision of the Board of Arbitration may be displeasing to the people, in fact, may be contrary to the fundamental law of the land. . . . That is one thing, which applies to both nations participating in arbitration. . . . Besides this, I have noted in my reading of history, that the thought and intent of the stronger nation, in the arbitration, is likely to prevail, in the findings of the Board. . . . Nevertheless, my government at this time will be glad to arbitrate, if necessary, the matters in dispute with the United States.

This position of President Calles—which probably heads of governments would generally hold—reveals that measures exist that are better than arbitration which should first be used. These are the methods of common sense and conciliation, which obtain in modern homes and schools, making it unnecessary to call in outside parties for the settling of disputes, by arbitration.

2. Arbitration, however, in the international realm, is always to be preferred to war—an appeal to force. Affairs in the international realm are still in a chaotic, unsatisfactory condition. Common sense and conciliation are in back seats. The method of arbitration marks progress, and to be preferred always to the appeal to war. To fix this in the public mind is desirable. Of course, it must be frankly acknowledged that peoples are not so apt to turn to arbitration while conspicuously armed, and especially while boasting of the glory of wars. The world will not be safe from the appeal to arms while nations are armed. Probably, nothing short of dehorning the nations will make men secure from the scourge of war. Nevertheless, the planting of an idea in the public mind—that arbitration is always to be sought in place of war—will be a great gain. The United States has a neighbor on the north, Canada—and on the south—Mexico. There has been no difference with Canada for over 100 years that has not been solved by conciliation or arbitration, and this without display of force along the border. War with Canada has become unthinkable. To suggest it would be to arouse laughter. Why fight? Nothing gained. Everything lost. So, with Mexico, our neighbor to the south. War with Mexico should be unthinkable. Common sense and conciliation would bring us far more than a war could, and at less cost of blood, treasure and self-respect:—for to wage war on a weaker nation hardly comports even with good sportsmanship. Our visit to Mexico has led us to believe that the same attitude toward Mexico that we show toward Canada would bring about a similar state of international good feeling—along with all the benefits, in trade and security that go with it.

At any rate, it ought to be registered in the minds of our citizens, that all differences arising between us and Canada and Mexico—such as titles to property and alleged injustices—could, and should, be settled by arbitration rather than by war.

We doubt if there is a war in history—this to include our own country—in which the point at issue might not have been by conciliation and arbitration better and more wisely settled, than it was by war. The losses in war are incalculable, and often apparently beyond remedy. The results of arbitration are not showy, but they are positive, and what is more to the point, by the methods of arbitration and conciliation, the spirit and mind of the citizens are ennobled and strengthened. This is all in the interests of manhood. War is such a ravager, that an increasing number of citizens—and these the most intelligent—are convinced

that it ought to be outlawed, i.e., numbered among the crimes against society.

Our conclusion is, that among the methods for securing peace between the nations arbitration has a distinct and essential place. It is not to be used until conciliation has been faithfully tried. It is always to be used before resort is had to war. When nations enter into arbitration treaties, agreeing to submit all disputes to arbitration, a step forward in civilization has been taken. They are to be cautioned, however, lest such treaties between a few nations turn out to be alliances aimed at those nations not in the circle. . . . In the back of the brains of sincere and intelligent promoters of the method of arbitration is always the aim that ultimately all the nations will enter into the higher stage of complete disarmament,—war, by arbitration, having been proved to be useless.

Anyone who accepts as his philosophy the unity of the human family and the brotherhood of man, as a practical, working basis of life, is forced to the belief that the ethics that secure order and peace in well-regulated family-groups and school groups—where the instruments of force have been eliminated—will certainly secure order and peace some time in the family of nations. . . . This consummation indeed has been secured between the sovereign States of our Union, to the extent that New York, Massachusetts, Ohio and California—with a variety of interests—do not dream of appealing to war to settle disputes between them. These States are so civilized in their relationships, that they have gone beyond even the necessity of appeal to arbitration. It should not be thought unreasonable, therefore, to ask that our country, in her relationships with Canada and Mexico—France, Japan and China—should always seek to settle disputes, first by conciliation, second by arbitration,—and never by war.

SYDNEY STRONG.

Jottings

The menace of Mussolini steadily increases. Now he talks about an army of 5,000,000 men. For what purpose? Why, for war, of course! That's what armies are for—to *fight*. "Simply that, and nothing more"—nor less!

The war against the theatre ticket speculators and their exorbitant prices is "on" again in New York. This is one reform movement, we must confess, in which we cannot get interested. When people *have* to go to the theatre, and *have* to pay $10 for a $3 seat, we shall get excited—but not before!

It is estimated that 33,425 men will attend 53 Citizens' Military Training Camps this summer. Desperate measures are resorted to in order to induce young men to join these camps. Advertising covers the landscape—it even blackens our letters! Employers are dragooned into bribing their employees by extending vacation privileges. Tuition is free, and expenses nominal. Yet the net result wouldn't fill much more than a third of the Yale Bowl, and less than half of the Harvard Stadium. How happy our military men must be!

The Michigan State College informs us that there are some 500 cooperative associations in Michigan, with 90,000 shareholders and members. This is an excellent record. But it still remains true that the growth of the cooperative movement in this country is deplorably slow.

We were reading the thrilling stories about Charles Lindbergh. Then we turned the page of our newspaper, and read—"Miss Day Tells of Thrills in Making Her Bow at Court." This is our idea of the difference between the real and the sham in human life.

"Jottings" will be discontinued with this issue until the fall. It will be resumed in our issue for September 19th next. J. H. H.

The Unity of the Mind

Beneath my changing feelings,
Beneath my changing will,
I sense a changeless something
That naught can ever kill.

O God, give me a purpose,
To keep alive this spark;
Blow Thou it full to flaming,
Illuminate the dark.

O God, give me a balance,
Preserve and keep me sane;
Let feeling, will, and reason
Their needed growth attain.

O God, give me a purpose,
That adds to life a zest;
And quiets inner conflicts
With unity and rest.

For UNITY. ELMO A. ROBINSON.

The Outlawry of War*

In his prophetical poem "Locksley Hall Sixty Years After," Tennyson had a vision of "Earth at last a warless world," but the vision of the warless world has been mocked by the most hideous war in human annals, with confident anticipations that if mankind go on playing the fool a far more hideous war is on the way.

Since Tennyson's day various attempts have been made to stay the plague, which has only raged more furiously like a fire that has enough wind blowing upon it to fan it higher but not enough to blow it out. We had various Hague Conferences, many Arbitration Treaties, and innumerable Peace Conferences while the Peace Societies pursued their leisurely way till Armageddon overtook the whole lot of us. It then became apparent that something more drastic must be done. Then arose the League of Nations with its appendant International Court of Justice, the little army of International War Resisters began to mobilize, and Peace Letters to Prime Ministers were signed by thousands. But hot preparations for the next war continue to go forward in every civilized country, and everybody is saying that nothing but a miracle can save us.

Well, that miracle is not going to happen, except by way of the joke which defines a miracle as "something that happens in America." The age of miracles is past, and if the age of reason has not yet come the human race will have to take the consequences of being a fool. No God will intervene to save us from our own wickedness and folly. The very reason of our existence here is to become wise and strong enough to work out our own salvation. But though God will not work miracles for us, he has given us power to work revolutions for ourselves; and such a revolution is on the way in the shape of a scheme to outlaw war—to declare war to be the arch-criminal of the earth, proscribed, ostracised, and excommunicated as a thing accursed of heaven and no longer tolerable on earth.

Pause for a moment to consider the agonies and losses inflicted by mankind upon themselves by their development and tolerance of war systems. What torments have they not undergone! What hellish sufferings! What deaths! What woes! What crimes! A vast proportion of their time and geinus and labor and wealth have been expended on the invention, manufacture, and employment of destructive weapons which wax crueler and more destructive with every advance of science—chemistry, engineering, mechanics and the rest. Fast as man the Sisyphus has climbed to some hill-top of achievement, War has snatched him back and flung him again into the abyss of misery. Fast as woman the Danaid has filled her pitcher with the water of life, War has pierced it with many holes, and left her to her ancient miseries among her unaccountable dead offspring. Let it be granted that a few precious gains man has made and held, but never at any time have the full possibilities of his existence been realized. War has been the thief and the robber who ever and anon has plundered and flung him bleeding by the wayside. Nor will he ever secure and enjoy the full increment of his improvements, inventions, and discoveries, until he has driven War forth as the assassin, devourer, and enemy of the human race.

The plan known as "The Outlawry of War" originated in the mind of a distinguished American lawyer, Salmon Oliver Levinson, by whose powerful influence it has taken its place as a factor in American politics. With unfaltering precision Mr. Levinson laid his finger on the fatal disease spot of war and the war-system,—namely, that it is regarded as a *lawful* system, and its deeds *lawful*. Here was one of the simple truths that lie hid for ages, and when stated seem like revelations. Really great truths seem simple when we hear them, but their effects are revolutionary, and the discovery made by this American lawyer may yet work the revolution which will realize the British poet's dream of a warless world. What is the design? It proposes to transform war from a lawful to an unlawful transaction; to make it illegal instead of legal; to brand it as a public crime. The method to be followed is given in the originator's own words:

> The programme for Outlawry of War could be largely effected by a general treaty among the nations agreeing to abolish the institution of war as the method of settling international disputes, arranging a convention for the codification of international law with the illegality of war as its major premise, and creating a court, or utilizing one of the existing courts with proper changes, and conferring upon it jurisdiction over the controversies of the nations.

In details, the plan contemplates the passing of a resolution by the United States Senate declaring that it favors the outlawry of war by international agreement; then the calling of a conference of all civilized nations to execute a general treaty for the outlawry of war; and then follows the codification of international law on the basis that war is a criminal act—from which it follows that those who engage in it are criminals, deserving a prison rather than a peerage. It needs no microscope to see that this would be one of the most tremendous revolutions in human history—turning the civilized world the right way up; reverting it from a foundation of Wardom to one of Peacedom; from Violence to Reason. "All great thoughts come from the heart," said a French philosopher, to which Lord Morley added, "But they must go round by the head." Mr. Levinson's great thought has gone round by his head.

The grandeur of this idea is that it does not hang the peace of the world on some super-state of force, but rests it upon the broad foundation of human nature and democratic good-will. Hear the author again:

> What does all this mean? It simply means that any arrangement, call it league, protocol, alliance, or treaty, must in the last analysis rest upon the good faith of the parties involved. It is a common proverb that the affairs of life hinge upon confidence. This is an adage the nations need to learn and to trust. Unless civilization cultivates and relies upon good faith, unless an appeal is made to the higher qualities of men, unless reason and law shall govern the controversies of the nations, there is no other God but Mars. What then is the answer to the question of how we propose to enforce the outlawry of war? The answer is obvious. We intend to rest its enforcement upon the will of the people themselves. We purpose to have a plebiscite in each civilized nation whereby, by overwhelming vote, the people will condemn and outlaw the war system, abolish the institution of war for the settlement of international controversies, and declare that the use of war for any purpose shall be made a crime under the law of nations. The people shall, under this plebiscite, severally pledge themselves to handle and punish their own war criminals. . . . The power to execute the law against war is lodged, where it belongs, with the respective peoples themselves. For, unless the civilized peoples of the world overwhelmingly vote to do away with the war system, nothing can be done. If they do so vote everything can be done, and war will cease.

*An address delivered before the Free Religious Movement in London, England, on Sunday, April 24, 1927.

That is clearly said and logically put. It stakes everything on human nature. If it were possible that the great majority of men and women would vote for the continuance of war and war-systems, then let them have all the war they want till they are effaced from the earth they have disgraced, and make way for a race with more sense. But that is inconceivable. The secret of power over men is to regard them as sane beings, as moral beings, as beings capable of accepting truth when it is clearly presented to them. The grand leaders of the world have acted on that principle; it was acceptance of the principle of human morality that made them grand and constituted their leadership. The outlawry of war must be the act of mankind as a whole.

Military systems are all based upon a false philosophy—the view that war is inseparable from human nature. That faithless philosophy was expressed by one who wrote to Charles Sumner saying, "An Anti-war Society is as little practicable as an Anti-thunder-and-lightning society." But as a matter of fact the whole modern world is a gigantic Anti-thunder-and-lightning society which has harnessed the thunder and lightning, turning it into electric light to illumine our homes, streets, and factories, and into electric power to drive our machines. In a similar way will the international vote turn man's moral and political energies into channels which will conserve all that is good, consolidate all that is great, and construct a civilization as much fairer than a militaristic one as Eden is fairer than Gehenna.

Sometimes the Poison-gas Philosophy takes a form even more extreme, alleging that the abolition of war would be a great calamity, since it is war that fosters courage, faithfulness, tenacity, inventiveness, etc., etc. War is regarded as God's ordeal who by its agency tests and sifts the nations and assigns each its due place in the scale of being. We remember with sadness how our own Ruskin lent his fair name to a doctrine which is as scandalously inhuman as it is ridiculously misleading. For it is absurd to argue that altruism is promoted by killing. If virtue is promoted by killing, then let us kill more in order to promote more virtue. Let us erect statues to those Mexican miscreants who the other day butchered a whole train-load in one fell sweep. Let us encourage civil war—war inside nations—as well as international war. Nay let us have war between individuals—duelling and the vendetta and street fights on all our doorsteps. The argument falls, because it proves too much.

We have also to confute a false sociology which affirms that war has been the great means of spreading civilization. We need not waste a breath on this fallacy. Modern travel, steam, electricity, flying, wireless, and the newspaper have put it out of court. War is anti-social. Neither is it now reasonable to urge that war is the only way to secure justice; for quite palpably war produces new injustices even in the act of professing to remedy old ones. I will rather maintain the contrary proposition,—namely, that wars are waged to secure ends so palpably unjust that they can be got in no other way. I have only to say "Versailles Treaty" to silence all contradiction. The only just world will be a warless world. Then equity and righteousness will have a chance.

Perhaps the greatest stronghold of War-philosophy is the perverted biology which emphasized the struggle for existence to such an extent as to cover up the equally important facts of mutual aid and the struggle for the life of others. That scientific Calvinism was the great mistake of the Victorian period. A revision of biological orthodoxy has brought us away from zoology to psychology, showing that spirit has evolved as well as body, that moral evolution advances beyond the point where physical development comes to an end, and that co-operation is as much a law of nature as is competition. Thus does progressive biology come to the support of peace. The age of military competition is closed. The age of international co-operation is here. The time has come to make our civilization morally and religiously commensurate with its material accumulations. Military civilization has involved immense hardship and cruelty, by giving greed and ambition their opportunity. Co-operative civilization will materialize into actuality that which a famous soldier characterized as a "dream" very doubtfully "beautiful." Before our very eyes Nature is fashioning a new type of man—a less nationalistic and less sectarian type of man, a type more *human* because of its universal emotion and outlook, a type conform to the universe with its laws of love and its tendencies towards unity, a type with reverence to the Supreme Life of which Universal Man is the embodiment. Gone are the slave-ages of Assyria and Egypt—gone the military imperialisms of Greece and Rome—gone the imperial sectarianism of the Holy Roman Empire,—each, however, leaving some deposit on which the world of Humanism may more securely base itself. The united onward march of the peoples has brought us at length to the humanistic period in which the happiness of mankind will no longer be sought by mutual conflict, but will be realized in a warless world consecrated to mutual service.

I bring forward a welcome ally to support the Outlawry of War by his revealing exposition in the name of science of the doctrine that man is naturally a good and pacific being. I refer to a booklet just published bearing the title "Human Nature"* by Dr. G. Elliot Smith, professor of anatomy in London University—a book which makes it probable that the new science of comparative anatomy is likely to be as revolutionary of racial theories as comparative mythology is proving to be in the sphere of religion. According to this remarkable and explosive little book, the facts accumulated by modern ethnologists definitely establish two fundamental principles—*first*, the innate goodness of man, and *second*, the reality of an original Golden Age of peace and contentment. Professor Smith regards these two principles as being established by "an overwhelming mass of unimpeachable testimony." When we add that this lecture was delivered before the Rationalist Association, without any thought of pacifist applications, its significance as an argument for the Outlawry of War is enhanced. Professor Smith complains of the prejudice and even ignorance with which orthodox biologists listen to this new doctrine which, though new as biological science, is as old as tradition, as old as the Greek poet Hesiod and the Hebrew sagas which express it in the poem of Eden.

In many parts of the world, the writer tells us, peoples survive who show clearly the early disposition of man in times before "civilization was invented." Let me quote his very words:

The evidence that is now accessible for study establishes

*"Human Nature," published by Watts & Co., paper cover 1/-, cloth gilt.

the fact that man is by nature a kindly and considerate creature, with an instinctive tendency to monogamy and the formation of a happy family group bound together by mutual affection and consideration. This is the basis of all social organization. The old theories of primitive promiscuity and lack of all sexual restraint are now shown to be devoid of any foundation and to be the very reverse of truth.

By way of illustration Professor Smith selects the Punans of Borneo, but this is not the occasion to follow his details. Well-known anthropologists, he says, have been astonished by the discoveries now being made which are so entirely contradictory of the old notions about the primitive so-called "savage." It transpires that we militarists are the savages! The really primitive peoples are "truthful, unaggressive, hospitable and sympathetic to strangers"; nor is the absence of warfare among them due to any lack of courage.

> It means that man is essentially peaceful and good-natured when free from artificial incentives to strife. . . . Natural Man is revealed to us as a merry and good-natured fellow, honest and considerate, chaste and peaceful, with a rich imagination and a fine sense of pictorial art and craftsmanship.

It is needless to quote further from this remarkable little book which ought to be bought by every pacifist and religious person, which might easily be, since it can be purchased for a shilling.

I must add that Professor Smith intimates a forthcoming book by a colleague of his own which he says will "reveal with remarkable consistency the character and behavior of people who have never come under the influence of civilization." We shall welcome Professor Perry's* book when it comes, seeing that "the matter at issue is of such fundamental importance for the understanding of human nature." . . . "One is compelled to regard such amiable traits as the original attributes of the whole human family."

I could go on quoting from this fascinating little book, but time forbids. Its value for Mr. Levinson and all of us who seek to make War the outlaw is—first, that it destroys the militaristic myth that man is by nature a fighting animal, and second, it shows that war is an interloper in the human sphere, war is the devil who jumped the hedge of Paradise, and we need have no tender scruples about kicking the trespasser out. The testimony of science now is that man is essentially a peaceful being who requires artificial stimuli to make him fight, which of course the newspapers are always ready to supply.

Professor Smith points out various reasons for what he describes as "the downfall of the Golden Age." I cannot go into them now. They all lead up to or include fighting, so that we are entitled to draw the general conclusion that it was War which ended the Golden Age, and to make the further inference that if we desire to get back the Golden Age while retaining all the cultural gains of civilization we must get rid of war. It is plain as a pikestaff. Yet Mars is a subtle god as well as a strong one. The gross act of war is easily indicted and condemned, but the war-system has its suckers deep in civilization's vitals, while the war mentality has grafted itself almost hopelessly on man's original peace psychology. Mr. Lowes Dickinson's latest book *The International Anarchy* shows clearly that as long as the war *system* remains the *act* of war is inevitable. In Mazzini's language: As long as the idol stands it will find worshippers. No sooner is one war over than diplomats and military mandarins are at their old tricks preparing for the next.

*Lecturer on Cultural Anthropology in London University.

In accomplishing the Outlawry of War, as we surely shall do, we shall be greatly helped by the true view of human nature I have just been expounding. The war-mentality is a foreign element in the human mind, a cancer, in the flesh, a virus in the blood, and, being a disease, is amenable to remedies and ultimate cure. We can cast out the bad foreign idea by the power of the good natural idea. Hence the wisdom of the admonition: "Seek peace, and pursue it." "Let us seek peace with all our hearts," cried Anatole France to a company of French teachers, "Desire it, for desire is the creative force, the only creative force in the universe!" As we survey the field of glorious endeavor for the emancipation of man from this ancient obsession, do we not feel that in the language of J. C. Squire it

> Takes on the quality of that magnificent
> Unshakable dauntlessness of human kind.

The Outlawry of War is possible within the lifetime even of some of us here who are no longer young. Let us take to heart the noble words of the man who conceived the great idea; let us echo them, repeat and re-repeat them till others catch them up and roll them along:

> The great cause of the present horrible plight of the world, particularly in Europe, is the infernal institution of war. That is the cause we must get rid of, namely, the right of a nation legally to go to war and to involve the world in agony, death, and destruction. Unless and until war is put under the condemnation of law, no possible progress can be made towards its removal from the future annals of civilization. The will of the people . . . is expressed by the declaration of law. Perhaps ninety-five per cent. of the people of the civilized world are against the institution of war. Let this moral sentiment be crystallized into the form of international law condemning and outlawing war, and the greatest possible improvement in civilization will have been made.
>
> Let the people exercise the power God has given them.

Mr. Levinson Speaks

The author of the scheme which prompted the foregoing discourse being present (with Mrs. Levinson), during its delivery, and being called to the platform, spoke, in part, as follows:

"I have been much inspired by the words of wisdom I have just heard. As I listened to Dr. Walsh I could not help thinking we were listening to Jenkin Lloyd Jones whom we borrowed from Wales. He spoke to audiences much the same in numbers as this, yet he was one of our great liberators, one of the most influential persons in our country in results. I don't know what's the matter with religious liberalism, it has such difficulty in getting people together, but if you offer them a short cut to salvation you can get them! This is the best possible place for the exposition of a subject of this kind, since to you it is perfectly clear that the great hold which war has on people's minds is the same tradition that holds men all over the world and which connects war with government as a necessary and inevitable thing; whereas we have the idea that we should be governed by people who can protect us from this 'inevitable' thing. Security cannot come from large military alliances. War is not inevitable. Disputes are inevitable. In human contracts there will always be disputes which may even increase by the increased contact facilities of our time—fast ships, wireless, etc. War is only one method—a wrong method—of settling those disputes. It is the war-system which produces Napoleons, Kaisers, and will produce more if it is not suppressed. We want to brand international war as a 'crime' against law just the same as wars of rebellion are regarded as 'crimes' by im-

perial powers. We want to make the first as unlawful as the second is. It should be as unlawful to start a war against another nation as it is to start one inside your own nation. Piracy has become disreputable, and war is infinitely more disreputable than is piracy. It asks everything from us—our money, our liberty, our life, our family; everything that is precious. An English-speaking Union could not keep the peace of the world. The worst thing we could do would be to form an Anglo-Saxon alliance.

"I am delighted to have come here, and I profoundly appreciate having heard Dr. Walsh. You remind me so much of the people I like to work with in my own country; and if you are few, the few always have to do the work."

WALTER WALSH.

Letters From Bartolomeo Vanzetti

All the world knows of Sacco and Vanzetti and a large part of the world are tremendously for them. The workers, vast in numbers, care for them as a rallying cry: if they are done to death on a frame-up, what other worker may not suffer a like fate if in some stress of labor difficulties they become obnoxious to those who own the earth? "Intellectuals," law school and other professors, clergymen, and thoughtful members of the Bar, scant in number but mighty in influence, such men as these care far more than for their own life and property, that the equal administration of the law, proud in its Anglo-Saxon traditions, shall be upheld. Few, however, of either of the above classes have any knowledge of the men they are defending.

As throwing some light upon the question and what manner of men are these whose fate has taken on such vast importance, a few extracts are submitted from letters recently received. They are transcribed as written, shortened somewhat, but with grammar and spelling as in the originals.

(1) On March 3, 1927, responding to a letter stating that I was in the hospital with a broken ankle, Vanzetti wrote:

Your good letter dated 29 Feb. has reached me yesterday and was most wellcomed. I am glad to be told that your rupture at the ancle does not causes you much pain and I hope you are doing splendidly and will soon be well again. . . .

Yes, I agree that capacity of pain is also capacity of joys without which we could not know happiness. Learsted men told us that pleasures are caused by slight, light vibrasions and pain by heavy or violent vibrasions: this, to me, explains why the so-called spiritual, moral, intellectual joys are superior to the physical ones: they are more genuine. Our passability to pains generate in us the distinction between pains and joys, and by way of contrast the former rend the second more blisful and precious. Out of this, I cannot reconcile the idea of happiness with pains,—though in a way, the shoting of pains maybe a short of incomplete happiness.

I wish to tell you a story: Once there was a sick king whose doctors had told that only his wearing of shirt of a happy man could have healed him. The king ordered to a troup of serves to begin immediately to search his kingdom and provide him a shirt of a happy man. They thought it an easy thing, and they begin by looking for a happy man in the very king's court. With great astonishment they failed to found him. Then they proced to look for him among the rich, the master, the priest, and other privileged. They failed equally. So they begin to look for an happy man among the peasants and workers, and humble folks. He was not there. And the king was going worst and the searchers were lossing hope. The kindom had been searched almost through—through—but the happy man had not been found. At last, when a band of searchers were on a road, they heard a man singing in a nearby wood, is voice as heartful as that of a nightingale. Leaded by his song, they reached him, a ragged begar. "Well man, you have a voice," they said. "No bad," he answered. They asked him to sing, and he sang for them. "Indeed," said the helder of the searchers, "you are a happy man." "Indeed I am," answered the begard. Hence he was asked to give them his shirt—"the king will make you rich," said the elder. Said the begar: "I am sorry but I have no shirt." When we say "happiness."!?!

As for "forgive and love thy foes" I believe in resistance to evil in action. At this point you see most evidently that if I begin to argue, I would end no more. So I don't begin—hopping that we will be soon able to argue by voice on this and on all others topics which we will like.

And, just to acknowledge my appreciation of your previous affection, before to proceed further, I sent you my better sentiments and thoughts. With great heart, yours, Bartolomeo.

(2) Again, pursuant of the same theme, he wrote:

Your letter of April 1, is at hand. Well, I realize from your words that you are a little impazient of your handicap, and I know by experience that you are right—"to not be able to walk" for incapacity to it is equivalent to be able to walk but kept chained—substantially. Being a great expert of this matter, I greatly sympatice with you. But, dear, Mrs. Evans, it seems to me that the doctor is right in his saying. A little imprudence, a false move due to impatience to walk make cause you a great harm and delay your guarigion. . . . You must help nature in her healing—by giving her the chance. And also, the only thing I can do is to pray you to be bravely, serenely, merrily patient and careful.

Each day that passes is a confermation to my believe that the Mass. Supreme Justices are just shame and afraid to let the world knows of their long-ready "no."

But the responsibilities are personal, and in the real reallity the abstract "America" does not exist. In reallity each country is a manifolded country. The anarchists of the whole world are of one, same-country. The hangers of the world too are of one same country. The country of the former as that of the later are world-wide and yet two different country. I cannot believe that you can be of the same country of the justices. So, do not let their infamy bother you. It as nothing to do with you. So, be of good cheer and patient. With great heart, yours, Bartolomeo.

(3) Morning, April 6, 7 o'clock, A. M.

Learnt of the refusal, by the full bench, I suppose. They murdered me two times under that golden dome of the Boston State House. Be of brave heart.

(4) Later on the day of April 6, Vanzetti wrote:

Your good letter has reached me just now. Yes, as far as our lives and freedom are concerned, all has been vain. I am now confined in a cell of Cherry Hill wing, antechamber of the death-house, waiting for my doom. As Wilbur has publicly said few months ago, "the sooner Sacco and Vanzetti be brought to they ultimate justice (!??!) the sooner the agitation will stop. And I have no illusions.

But yours and our comrades and friends' solidarity and generosity has written a wonderful paragraph in history. It helped us and it will safe other,—it will never have been done in vain.

Be patient and of great heart, Comrade Evans, and have all my good wishes and affection. Always yours, Bartolomeo Vanzetti.

(5) On April 13th, when the tide of protest in his and Sacco's behalf had risen to considerable proportions, Vanzetti wrote:

Your good letter is received. I will be glad to see you again. It seems as if finally the people are following you in our defense and I know that your heart throb with joy for it. I'm also proud to know and rehear from you that you like my little letters. With all my blesses to you, I am yours, Bartolomeo.

Letters from Sacco, equally moving in their contents and equally revealing of the manner of man he is, will follow in the next issue.

ELIZABETH GLENDOWER EVANS.

England's Bunker Hill

To many people, as it was to me, it will be a surprise to learn that there is another Bunker Hill besides our own historic one. England has, in fact, two Bunker Hills, one in Lincolnshire, and one close to London, abutting on Hampstead Heath. It is now proposed to make the latter an Anglo-American Memorial to the soldiers of the Great War.

A letter and circular have recently been received from Dame Henrietta Barnett of No. 1, South Square, Hampstead Heath Garden Suburb, London, telling of this interesting project. I thought that the public if not already informed, might be interested to know about it.

There may have arisen in the minds of some who have reached this point in my story, these questions: Who is Dame Henrietta Barnett? What and where is Hampstead Heath Garden Suburb? I will answer these questions briefly before proceeding with the account of the Bunker Hill project.

Of Mrs. Barnett, a writer in the *Outlook* said, a year or two ago, "She is the most venerated and authoritative woman in English public-life."

The title "Dame" is one conferred on women, by the King, in recognition of high public service rendered by them, and after that the title is used in addressing these women, as is the title "Sir" with men, similarly honored.

Her husband, who later in his life was Canon of Westminster, was in his youth the vicar of a church on the East Side of London, in the congested Whitechapel region. Then he founded Toynbee Hall, the first University Settlement. It is estimated that today there are in the United States at least 480 settlements following in the steps of Toynbee Hall.

In the long service of Mr. Barnett, it would be impossible to mention any movement undertaken by him, in which his wife was not "a complete and effective participant."

After the death of her husband, Mrs. Barnett, upon her own initiative and almost unaided raised the money to purchase the site for, and to develop, the Hampstead Heath Garden Suburb, which, she has said, is a working out of the logic of the Settlement. In a recent statement Mrs. Barnett says:

> It grew out of my realization that different social classes suffered from their ignorance of each other. For all the rich to live in one quarter of the town, and for the poor to be grouped together in another quarter, robs each section of the pleasure of the other's friendship, and the development of character and the enlargement of interests which naturally follow the mixture of different standards of education, different business experiences, and different methods of using leisure.

The Suburb affords people of humble means an opportunity to get away from the crowded quarters of a great city, and find a place "in the open," where they could have a comfortable home and garden, and where their children could know what the sky and green fields and natural beauty really are. The distance of Hampstead Heath from London, makes it easy for working men and women to get back and forth.

When I visited the place in the summer of 1925, a circular put in my hands said that in the years since May, 1907, when the first sod was cut, and in spite of the fact that for six years there was an actual stoppage of building—there had been erected 2,000 homes, with accommodations for 10,000 people. Each home has a garden and bath. The population now is considerably beyond that figure.

Since the purpose of this article is not to tell of the Garden Suburb except as incidental to my theme, I will proceed with the subject as given above. The English Bunker Hill is symmetrically rounded and with a gradual slope to base, like its namesake in Boston, thus easily accounting for the transfer of its name by the Puritan Colonists to the new Country. Its locations is divided by a road from Hampstead Heath to which thousands and hundreds of thousands of people from London go on holidays "for rest and pleasure and beauty."

Recently the Hill has been put up for sale. The owners, not unnaturally, being eager to take advantage of the insistent demand for homes, want to cut it up into lots. This means that only the residents instead of the visiting public will have the glorious view to be had from the slopes and summit of this anciently named hill. "For Sale" signs have been displayed on its sides for some time.

Now on account of intercepting influences a few months of grace have been given before this is done; and right here is where the venerable Dame Henrietta comes in. She has had the vision of making it a memorial to the British and American Soldiers who fought side by side in the Great War.

I will let the circular which reached me recently tell the plan:

> To strengthen the bonds of friendship between England and America is the desire of all people who think in both nations.
>
> There are two Bunker Hills—one near Boston, Massachusetts, U. S. A., one adjoining Hampstead Heath, near London, England.
>
> On the summit of the Bunker Hill near Boston stands a monument, erected to commemorate—the battle—1775—that the American troops fought in the cause of right and liberty against the troops sent from England.
>
> On the summit of the Bunker Hill near London there is nothing now but a hedge and some trees, but it might be made into a beautiful monument to commemorate two great events: (1) That in the War, 1914-18, the American men fought side by side with English men in the cause of right and liberty. (2) That the United States Government in 1921 called and carried through a conference at Washington, whereby a momentous step was taken towards future peace between nations.
>
> The one Bunker Hill has told of *division*, the other Bunker Hill will tell of *union*, and can be in a very real sense "A Hill of Reconciliation."

The circular says further:

> This suggestion was put forth by a committee of American and English people (Dame Henrietta Barnett, D. B. E., as Chairman) which has been formed to purchase Bunker Hill in the belief that the beautiful open space and the wide view from it, enriched by the suggestions for thoughts that are part of the scheme, will attract hundreds of thousands of visitors who will thus be reminded of the Union between England and America, and her noble aspirations for international peace and deeds of helpfulness during the war.

The cost of purchasing and laying out, with suitable walks and seats, this Hill of Reconciliation would be from £10,000 ($50,000) to £15,000 ($75,000), according to the amount of land acquired on the slopes of the hill.

In a radio talk on the 5th of October last, Dame Henrietta said:

> We hope that the British people will subscribe half of the needed money in grateful memory of the soldiers from

the United States, and that the American people will subscribe the other half of the needed money in recognition of the sacrifice English people made. What we want is that every one who can shall give.

She says also in the same radio talk: (Remember that this was primarily for home consumption).

I have been twice in America, once with my husband, Canon Barnett, thirty-five years ago, and once in a lecture tour in 1921, and each time I have returned with the determination to do my little bit to help England to understand and appreciate the American mind, character and natural ideals better than they do. I delight in the Americans, their efficiency, their resolution to arrive at the foundation of things; their system of making "surveys" before they take action, their recognition of ideals—and a few other virtues which would sound like flattery if I said them all.

It seems to me that this noted woman has, by the plan here described, added to her notable record of service for humanity a crowning effort—fine, strong, tender; that if, with the help of Americans, this plan can be carried out, newly dedicated Bunker Hill will stand in evidence of the growth of good feeling which has taken place in the one hundred fifty years, since ours was made memorable in history. Like the monuments—(none too many and in some places conspicuously missing)—that have been erected since 1918 in our country, it will serve to admonish future generations of their obligations, and will be needed for that purpose, "lest they forget."

MARY D. BRADFORD.

The Story of My Experiments with Truth

[The Autobiography of Mahatma Gandhi]

(Copyrighted, 1927)

PART III—CHAPTER X

The Boer War

I must skip many another experience of the period between 1897 and 1899 and come to the Boer War. When the war was declared my personal sympathies were all with the Boers, but I believed then that I had yet no right in such cases to enforce my individual convictions. I have minutely dealt with the inner struggle in this behalf in my history of the Satyagraha in South Africa, and I must not repeat the argument here. I invite the curious to turn to those pages. Suffice it to say that my loyalty to the British rule drove me to participation with the British in that war. I felt that if I demanded rights as a British citizen, it was also my duty as such to participate in the defense of the British Empire. I held then that India could achieve her complete emancipation only within and through the British Empire. So I got together as many comrades as possible, and with very great difficulty had their services accepted as an ambulance corps. The average Englishman believed that the Indian was a coward incapable of taking risks or looking beyond his immediate self-interest. Many English friends therefore threw cold water on my plan. But Dr. Booth supported it whole-heartedly. He trained us in ambulance work. We secured medical certificates of fitness for service. Mr. Laughton and the late Mr. Escombe enthusiastically supported the plan and we applied at last for service at the front. The Government thankfully acknowledged our application, but said that our services were not then needed.

But I would not rest satisfied with this refusal. Assisted by Dr. Booth I called on the Bishop of Natal. There were many Christian Indians in our corps and the Bishop was delighted with my proposal and promised to help us in getting accepted.

Time too was working with us. The Boer had showed more pluck, determination and bravery than were expected; and our services were ultimately needed.

Our corps was 1,100 strong with nearly 40 leaders. About three hundred were free Indians and the rest indentured. Dr. Booth was also with us. The corps acquitted itself well. Though our work was to be outside the firing line, and though we had the protection of the Red Cross, we were asked at a critical moment to serve within the firing line. The reservation was not of our seeking. The authorities did not want us to be within the range of fire. But the situation was changed after the repulse at Spion Kop and General Buller sent the message that though we were not bound to take the risk, Government would be thankful if we would take it and fetch the wounded from the field. We had no hesitation and so the action at Spion Kop found us working within the firing line. During these days we had to march from twenty to twenty-five miles a day, bearing the wounded stretchers. Among the wounded we had the honour of carrying soldiers like General Woodgate.

The corps was disbanded after six weeks' service. After the reverses at Spion Kop and Vaalkranz the British Commander-in-Chief had abandoned the attempt to relieve Ladysmith and other places by summary procedure, and had decided to await reinforcements from England and India, and to proceed slowly.

Our humble work was, at the moment, much applauded, and the Indians' prestige was enhanced. The newspapers published laudatory rhymes whose refrain was "We are sons of Empire after all."

General Buller mentioned with appreciation the work of the corps in his despatch and the leaders were awarded the War Medal.

The Indian community became better organized. I got into closer touch with the indentured Indians. There came a greater awakening amongst them, and the feeling that Hindus, Musalmans, Christians, Tamilians, Gujaratis and Sindhis were all Indians and children of the same motherland took deep root among them. Every one believed that the Indians' grievances were now sure to be redressed. The White man's attitude seemed to be distinctly changed at the moment. The relations formed with the Whites during the War were of the sweetest. We had come into contact with thousands of Tommies. They were friendly with us, and were thankful to us to know that we were there to serve them.

I cannot forbear from recording a sweet reminiscence of how human nature shows itself at its best at moments of trial. We were marching towards

Chievely-camp where Lieutenant Roberts, the son of Lord Roberts, had received a mortal wound. Our corps had the honour of carrying the body from the field. It was a sultry day—the day of our march. Everyone was thirsting for water. There was a tiny brook on the way where we could slake our thirst. But who was to drink first? We had proposed to come in after the Tommies had finished. But they would not begin first and urged us to do so, and for a while a pleasant competition went on for giving precedence to one another.

M. K. GANDHI.

(*Translated from Navajivan by Mahadeo Desai.*)

The Study Table

"The American Race Problem"

Dr. E. B. Reuter has written a book* upon the problem which almost invariably is approached from the standpoint of personal bias. The personal feelings enter in so closely to the consideration of the status and rights of the Negroes in America that it is almost impossible to obtain a clear, calm, and judicial discussion of them. Dr. Reuter has accomplished the almost impossible task. He has so written on this question to warrant the statement by his publishers that his attitude is so obviously impartial as to inspire the respect and confidence of students.

But he goes further than mere attitude of impartiality. He uses the undoubted scholar's right to present and weigh evidence, but he presents the evidence so fairly, oftentimes stating the position with which he certainly does not agree as clearly and forcibly as if he were in entire harmony with it, that his own conclusion carries the authority of a court of last resort.

Reared and educated and having taught in the South, he is thus capable of seeing the whole problem from Southerner's point of view. Dr. Reuter, however, nowhere in his book reveals a local and narrow provincial approach to the subject. He is at all times the scholar and the scientist dealing with his facts objectively. If anyone thinks this is too high praise, let him read the book and judge for himself.

Beginning with a brief survey of the history of the Negro race in America, Dr. Reuter has considered practically every phase of the problems that have arisen out of the relations between the two races. His chapter on Race as a Social Concept is remarkably clear statement of the best anthropological opinion at the present time on the question of race and national characteristics. His chapter on Racial Differences is a summary of the evidences, pro and con, bearing upon the question of racial inferiority and superiority. His own conclusion is in harmony with that of men like Boas of Columbia and Dr. von Luschan of Berlin and practically all other anthropologists of recognized scholarship. He says in reference to this,

> For approximately two decades there has been virtual agreement among scholars; all accept as a provisional but fairly well-founded working hypothesis the position that the various races and peoples of the world are essentially equal in mental ability and capacity for civilization.

It is admitted that there are certain general well-marked characteristics which identify the Negro but none of these appear to have any vital connection with his mental capacity. It is sometimes said that these peculiar characteristics closely ally the Negro to the ape. But this loses its significance when we realize that the thin lips and the hairy bodies of the white man in these respects more closely identify him with apes than they do the Negro. His brain is smaller on the average, but the brains of white women are on the average smaller than white men. But no one would have the temerity today to argue that women are mentally inferior to men. The studies of Dr. Bean of Johns Hopkins had definitely shown that the slight differences between the weights of the Negro and European brains do not warrant any generalization in reference to mental ability.

It is true that in Africa the Negro is culturally backward, but that was true of the Europeans as compared to the Egyptians some four thousand years ago. It is absurd to rank one race higher than another simply because its cultural development occurred at an earlier time. The cultural retardation of the Negro is impossible to deny. Dr. Reuter has made it clear that this is due to lack of cultural opportunities. In a brief but clear analysis of the significance of the army examinations in relation to the Negro he shows very clearly that the Negro did not have a fair chance in those tests and that the difference between them and the Whites can be explained on the basis of lack of school and other cultural opportunities.

Before the war the Negro occupied a position of a caste group. And since the attainment of freedom, there has been more emphasis of the race difference. Nevertheless much of the prejudice against the Negro is to be explained on the ground of caste. The story of the Negro's development in economic field, in education, in literature, art and music, through his assimilation of white culture, is graphically told. There seems to be no question but that much that is commonly attributed to the Negro as distinct racial traits are the product of his environment. The Negro has, because of prejudice against him and the lack of opportunity, developed a definite race consciousness. This has been accelerated by increasing educational opportunities. This has resulted in an increase of racial prejudice against him. This in turn has tended to develop a higher sense of racial consciousness which in turn brings more antagonism. The result of this vicious circle tends to handicap the Negro because he is inclined to support business and professional men of his own race not because they can give him better service but merely because they belong to his own group. While immediately this racial solidarity may give certain advantages, in the long run it operates to the disadvantage of the Negro and so the disadvantage of the whole community. It tends to make the Negro satisfied with inferior institutions on the one hand and arouses the fears and antipathies and prejudices of the Whites on the other. It is this situation which is disadvantageous to both the Negroes and to the Whites. And just so long as there is a denial of the equality of opportunity for any one group, the welfare of the whole group is endangered. Dr. Reuter believes ultimately that as a result of intermixture the Negro as such will disappear from the population and then the problem will be solved. But that time is in a far dis-

*The American Race Problem, by E. B. Reuter. Crowell's Social Science Series. 460 pp.

The Field

"The world is my country, to do good is my Religion."

INTERNATIONAL FELLOWSHIP OF RECONCILIATION

(Monthly News Sheet)

Belgium.—*The Women's International League* Executive Committee had a vivid experience of pioneer work for peace at its meeting in Liége in March, at which it helped Lucie Dejardin, its Belgian Consultative member, to form a working group. Of the two meetings announced, one at the University and one at the People's House, the first was forbidden at the last moment by the University Administration, on the ground that no German—in this case Gertrud Baer—should be allowed to speak on this sacred spot. At the hour announced for the meeting, two women held up placards stating the reason why it was not to be held, and advertising the other meeting. They courageously stood their ground, in spite of an unfriendly and even violent demonstration of students, and by so doing they aroused so much interest in Liége that about 1,000 people were present at the later meeting, at which women of eleven nationalities gave addresses on Education for Peace. On the platform was a University student, who had been in Germany, and who, on behalf of a body of friendly students, apologized for the hostile demonstration, and gave a special welcome to the German speaker. When Gertrud Baer rose and took his hand he reverently kissed her before the large Belgian audience, who for the first time had begun to understand the reality of world brotherhood, and now gave the German visitor a tremendous welcome.

Finland.—Swedish and Finnish women citizens of Finland have joined together in forming one section of the Women's International League in that country. Mrs. Beskow, a Swedish member of the W.I.L. and of the Fellowship of Reconciliation, writes: "What is remarkable about this new section is that, though two quite different languages, Swedish and Finnish, are spoken in Finland and the question of language plays a prominent part in political life, the Finnish women formed one section. This means that all the minutes, discussions and literature must be in two languages. At the very starting point this Section thus expressed their wish to reconcile and unite both groups."

France.—*A Rousing Appeal* to French women to resist the new French Conscription Law, and, if need be, to go to prison rather than submit to it, has been published by Mme. Camille Drevet, a French member of the Women's International League. The Executive Committee of the W.I.L. was so much stirred by her report of the proceedings in the Chamber, that it has sent a letter of protest to M. Paul Boncour, the Deputy, who, though he has hitherto proclaimed himself a convinced pacifist, was actually one of the supporters of the Bill. It was, in fact, rushed through the Chamber so that he might hurry to Geneva to attend the Preparatory Disarmament Commission. In another letter, the W.I.L. Executive has thanked Mr. Ernest Lafont, the only French Deputy who attacked the Bill with vigor, and asked him to read their protest in the Chamber, to which he replied that he would make every effort to secure the necessary opportunity. The international effects of the new law, which have been anticipated by an appeal of the W.I.L. Executive to its national sections to prevent the adoption of similar measures in their respective countries, is illustrated by the recent statement in the Reichstag of the German Minister of the Reichswehr: "This French law must mean: either general disarmament or the possibility for Germany to arm in the same measure as her neighbors."

Germany.—*The exhibition of Peace Work,* illustrating the activities of the Peace Movement in all countries, which was held at Munich from April 22 to May 6, had in its Committee of Honor notable representatives of very different sections of the community, including the Catholic Women's League, the Christian Trade Unions, the University, the Social Democratic Women's Committee, the Carmelite Monastery, the Trade Unions, and the Evangelical Community. The educational value of such exhibitions has been shown recently by the "No More War" Exhibition held in Dresden, which has aroused great interest even among children, and made them eager to arrange "peace trips" for the coming summer, in order to make friends with Belgian children.

A Pacifist Motion: "That lasting peace can only be secured by the people of England adopting an uncompromising attitude of pacifism," was passed by the Union Society of Cambridge University in March, by 213 votes to 138. This expression of opinion on the part of students is significant owing to the conservative tendencies of the older English Universities.

New Zealand. — Our correspondent in New Zealand reports that the militarist authorities are hard at work. They recently organized a great military pageant which by its spectacular features attracted the unthinking portion of the community. One clergyman suggested as an antidote that a parade should be held of the hundreds of disabled soldiers who have been badly treated by the Government. A recent innovation in military training in secondary schools is the formation of an artillery section in the Mount Albert Grammar School, which has been provided with two 4.5 howitzers by the Defence authorities. Although the boys dare not express any anti-militarist feeling, among themselves they loathe military training. One or two of the masters in various secondary schools have dared to raise a protesting voice—only to lose their posi-

SPECIAL NOTICE

If you like UNITY you will help to put it in the hands of others.

Here is an easy way.

UNITY will be sent to your friends, for six months, for $1 each. Send in the dollars with the names, or send in the dollars, and UNITY will supply the names.

These subscriptions will begin soon, with ANNA LOUISE STRONG'S weekly LETTERS to UNITY from China and the Orient. (See page 244)

These letters are expected to run for six months.

Mail to
UNITY, 700 Oakwood Blvd., Chicago

Here is a place for a few names. Use larger slip for others.

.....

.....

.....

(OVER)

tant future. In the meantime there exists the task of defining relations between the two groups in terms that are tolerable between members of both.

After reading Dr. Reuter's book anyone with a fair and open mind cannot help but have a more sympathetic and more generous attitude toward the Negro race. He will find that most of his prejudices, if he has any, rest upon sandy foundations. This book should be read not only by students of social problems but by every citizen of the United States. What we need above all things in discussing this problem is not heat but light. It is light, clear, white light, that is shed by the study of "The American Race Problem."

ARTHUR L. WEATHERLY.

Use This Blank Check and Help UNITY'S Family Grow

Pay to the order of UNITY (700 Oakwood Boulevard, Chicago) ..... Dollars

For subscription to UNITY for six months, $1 each—beginning with Anna Louise Strong's Letters from China.

Name .....

Address .....

Name of Bank ..... City ..... State ..... Date .....

tions and find themselves unable to secure other work. In the opinion of our correspondent, compulsory military training would be abolished if a vote were to be taken on the question, but at present the people have no voice in the matter.

It's a "Case" of Necessity

Your Printing will be above criticism if done by

THE OAKLAND PRESS

3913 Cottage Grove

Tel. Atlantic 1876

BIRTH CONTROL REVIEW

Not a **class** periodical.

In every aspect of a subject fundamental to a sane and happy human society, a **general** periodical of vital interest.

Take a trial subscription for six months at $1.00, and receive with it a complimentary copy of the May "Marriage" number of the Birth Control Review, and beginning a series on Marriage based upon John Haynes Holmes' sermons.

Enclose this advertisement with your subscription to:

Birth Control Review

104 Fifth Avenue

NEW YORK CITY

IN JUNE

The vacation period commences. Travel by motor, train or water, sports of many kinds, country club and resort activities make unusual demands of the wardrobe. Preparations, to be adequate, should include needed cleansing of any garment by our processes so particularly efficient and trustworthy.

Schumann & Co

Cleaners Dyers

PHONE DREXEL 0351 ALL DEPARTMENTS

MAIN OFFICE AND WORKS

3960 Cottage Grove Avenue

DREXEL State Bank

Cottage Grove Ave. and Oakwood Blvd.

Thirty-two years of conservative banking, combined with service and courtesy for every depositor —large or small—is the record of this bank . . . . . .

Your savings and checking account cordially invited

Resources Six and one-half Million Dollars

Do This for their sake!

GIVE your children Bowman's Milk. It furnishes quick energy to offset fatigue. It builds fine teeth and strong bones. A quart a day is none too much, so doctors say.

BOWMAN DAIRY COMPANY MILK

Phone Oakland 480 **JANITORS' SUPPLIES**

Everything in HARDWARE

AT

PORTER'S

4236 Cottage Grove Ave.